

REMARKS

The rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-12 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 5,002,491 (Abrahamson) and 6,302,698 (Ziv-El) is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Abrahamson and Ziv-El patents fail to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, the claimed combination of:

- a. a teaching computer with a built-in interactive learning software program;
- b. operational devices for use by students to output operation instructions to the teaching computer in order to use the interactive software program; and
- c. a portable computer, which is in addition to the teaching computer, for use by the teacher in order to output control instructions to the teaching computer, the control instructions allowing the interactive learning software to selectively accept operating instructions from particular operational devices.

In contrast to the conventional teaching system, in which a teacher sits at his or her desk and controls the teaching computer to accept input from operational devices held by the students, the claimed invention adds another computer, namely a portable computer, that allow the teacher to control the teaching computer while moving around the classroom.

The claimed invention thus includes a teaching computer and operational devices, which correspond to the prior art, and adds an additional portable computer that frees the teacher to walk around the classroom while still controlling the teaching computer. As a result, the teacher can help individual students or prevent cheating while using the computer to, by way of example, give a quiz.

Neither of the references suggests the combination of (a) a teaching computer, (b) operational devices, *and* (c) a portable computer, as claimed, the portable computer being specifically recited as outputting control instructions that allow the interactive learning software on the teaching computer to selectively accept operating instructions from the operational devices. The Abrahamson patent, as discussed below, only teaches (a) and (b), while the Ziv-El

patent teaches a variation of the Abrahamson system in which the teaching computer is networked, but no additional portable computer is provided for outputting control instructions to the teaching computer.

The control instructions output by the claimed portable computer are specifically adapted to control the interactive learning software, and in particular to control how the interactive learning software accepts operational instructions from individual students. This is explained in detail in the present specification. For example, according to the invention, the teacher could cause the portable computer to output an instruction telling the interactive learning software to accept instructions from Jane's operational device and John's operational device, but not from Jim's. Alternatively, the teacher could cause the portable computer to output an instruction telling the interactive learning software to accept the first operating instruction received from any operational device. Neither of the applied patents teaches anything similar.

The Abrahamson patent discloses a teaching system with a teaching computer 10 connected to a projector 20 and VCR 30, and student operational devices 40. Abrahamson does not disclose or suggest any sort of additional computer, much less a portable one as claimed, that outputs control instructions for causing the interactive learning software on the teaching computer to selectively accept operating instructions from particular operational devices. In order to control the interactive learning software, the teacher must use the central computer 10. There is no additional control computer, much less a portable one.

The Ziv-El patent does not make up for the deficiencies of the Abrahamson patent. While it discloses multiple teaching computers 1a,1b in communication with multiple student computers 9,21 (through servers 6-8), none of the teaching computers outputs control instructions to any of the other teaching computers, the control instructions determining how the other teaching computer(s) accepts operational instructions from the student computers 9,21.

It is true, as noted by the Examiner, that the student computers of Ziv-El may be portable. However, this has nothing to do with the present invention. The student computers of Ziv-El correspond to the claimed student operational devices, which output operational instructions to the teaching computer. None of the student computers of Ziv-El outputs **control** instructions for telling the interactive learning software on the teaching computer which student computers to **selectively accept operational** instructions from. Ziv-El, like Abrahamson, fails to disclose or suggest such an additional teaching computer having the claimed control function, *whether portable or not*. The fact that the **student** computers may be portable is not suggestive of providing an additional portable **teaching** computer for controlling which of the student computers to accept operational instructions (such as test answers) from.

Since neither the Abrahamson patent nor the Ziv-El patent discloses or suggests providing the teacher with two computers, one to interact with student operational devices and the other to control the interactions, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 1-8 and 10-12 is not obvious in view of the two patents (or any other reference of record), and therefore withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome the sole rejection made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejection and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: June 28, 2006

Serial Number 10/656,367



BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB.S:\V\produce\bba\Pending Q...\YYYYANO 656367a01.wpd